

REMARKS

No claims have been amended in this paper. Claims 1-33, 47-55, 77-81, 85-90, and 97-99 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-45, 47-55, 60-66, 68-69, 77-81, 84-95, and 97-99 are pending in the present application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application as amended are respectfully requested.

The examiner rejected claims 34-45, 60-66, 68, 69, 84 and 91-95 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention in various preferred embodiments is directed to a wrist support that includes a rigid plastic exostructure of one or more pieces that is directly molded to an inner soft fabric support. The wrist support has an optional web portion extending across the web of the hand, which web portion is attached to the wrist support by a hinge at one side. An axis of rotation of the hinge is not co-planar with the rigid plastic exostructure (i.e., the pivot axis of the web portion does not lie in a common plane defined by the rigid exostructure). This feature is shown in, for example, Fig. 35 of the pending application.

Applicant provided an analogy in the response filed on September 29, 2005, at page 14, in the second full paragraph: the analogy was to a door whose door hinges used to attach the door to the door frame have an axis of rotation coplanar with a plane defined by the door while an axis of rotation not lying in or coplanar with the door is represented by the door knob whose axis of rotation is perpendicular to the plane defined by the door.

To better illustrate this concept, applicant has amended FIG. 35 of sheet 12/20 by adding an axis line A and a line B to each hinge point 608, 610, and has submitted Replace Sheet 12/20 bearing this amendment. There are no other changes to drawing sheet 12/20.


Each line B is generally coplanar with the exostructure 600 near hinge points 608, 610, while each axis line A extends almost perpendicular to but certainly not co-planar

with the exostructure plane containing axis B. In the door analogy, the door is represented by the exostructure 600 defining a plane containing and co-planar with line B, while the axis of rotation of the door knob or hinge points 608, 610 is represented by axis line A, which is not co-planar with the door/plane/exostructure 600 containing line B.

Moreover, rotational axis line A is consistent with the curved, two-headed arrows shown in FIG. 35 that indicate the hinge points 608, 610 rotate about their respective axis line A. Now FIG. 35 clearly shows that the “axis of rotation of said hinge is not co-planar with said molded plastic exostructure” as recited in claim 34 for example. Since adding dashed lines A and B to FIG. 35 to supplement the two-headed arrows is meant only as a clarification, no new matter has been introduced.

Applicant has also amended a paragraph of the specification at page 19 to describe the dashed lines A and B added to FIG. 35. Applicant believes the support for lines A and B was already present in the description on page 19 and in FIG. 35 as originally filed in view of the two-headed arrows indicating the rotation of the hinge points 608, 610, so the addition of lines A and B and the associated text to the specification were merely an express clarification of an inherent teaching. Applicant thus does not believe any new matter has been introduced. Applicant kindly asks the examiner to enter the amendment to the drawing of FIG. 35 and the specification at page 19.

In view of the lines A and B and the two-headed arrows in FIG. 35, and the explanation in the specification at page 19, it should be clear that the axis of rotation (line A) of the hinge points 608, 610 is not co-planar with said molded plastic exostructure 600 (plane containing line B), so that the inventors indeed had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed. Applicant respectfully contends that the rejected claims now fully comply with the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, written description requirement.



The examiner rejected claims 34-45, 60-66, 68, 69, and 91-95 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant relies on the amendment to the drawings, the specification, and the reasons given above, and respectfully submits that the rejected claims now fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Applicant relies on the amendment to the drawings, the specification, and the reasons given above, and respectfully submits that the drawings now fully comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a).

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that all claims are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested and allowance at an early date is solicited. The Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 06-2425 for any unforeseen fees arising from the filing of this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP

By: Paul Y. Feng
Paul Y. Feng
Registration No. 35,510

PYF:gbr

Howard Hughes Center
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Telephone: (310) 824-5555
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696
Customer No. 24201

127009.1